

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-24 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent. In the Office Action dated October 27, 2004, the specification was objected to, Claims 17-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, but were deemed allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome this rejection, and Claims 1-16 were allowed. Following this response, Claims 1-24 remain in this application. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's objections and rejections in turn.

I. Objection to the Specification

In the Office Action dated October 27, 2004, the Examiner objected to the specification due to missing status information of a co-pending application. The specification has been amended to add the requisite status information and to address typographical errors. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this objection and adds no new matter.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 17 has been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this

rejection of Claims 17-24 and adds no new matter. Support for this amendment can be found at least in the specification in paragraphs 46 and 47.

III. Allowance of Claims

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner pass Claims 1-16 to issue.


IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.



Dated: January 27, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640  
(404) 653-6559